


To the extent that Plaintiff’s motion is one for this Court’s reconsideration of the above-noted Orders, Plaintiff has not made a showing entitling him to such relief.

“Motions for reconsideration serve a limited function: to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.” *Hagerman v. Yukon Energy Corp.*, 839

F.2d 407, 414 (8th Cir. 1988) (citation omitted). “A motion for reconsideration is not a vehicle for simple reargument on the merits.” *R.G. Brinkmann Co. v. Amerisure Ins. Co.*, No. 4:11CV1125 JAR, 2013 WL 328662, at *1 (E.D. Mo. Jan. 29, 2013) (citation omitted). Plaintiff’s motion sets forth no manifest error of law or fact, nor does it present any newly discovered evidence. Rather, the motion reiterates Plaintiff’s arguments raised in his previous filings, and Plaintiff’s theories on the societal ramifications of the Court’s Orders.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff Charles Glover’s “Motion to Appeal all Orders” is **DENIED**. (Doc. No. 39.)


AUDREY G. FLEISSIG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 25th day of August, 2015.